

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Claims 14-19 and 21-26 are pending in the application. By this Amendment, claims 14, 16-18 and 24-26 are amended and claim 20 has been cancelled. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 14-19 and 21-26 are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. SPECIFICATION

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification and claim 14 due to minor informalities. In response, the Applicant has respectfully amended the specification and claims as shown above to correct the minor informalities. Accordingly, the objection is believed to be overcome. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

III. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

On pages 2-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 14-19, 24 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.K. Patent Application GB 2324197 to Pool.

Pool describes a photodetector for detecting X-ray photons, in which there is a single detector area 1. In contrast with the present invention, Pool's device is not an imager.

As amended, Claim 14 is directed to an imager with parallel channels, at least some of the parallel channels being divided by the path defining structures. The paths ensure that signal charge generated across the entire width of the channel is collected together into regions of smaller area so that the likelihood of interaction with traps is reduced, and charge containment is maintained near the optimum for all signal levels up to the full well.

It is respectfully submitted that Pool does not teach or suggest the above required limitations for an imager device.

IV. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

On pages 4-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0191093 to Hyneck.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,199,691 to Angle.

On pages 5-6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,207,981 to Hatano et al.

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,380,056 to Parrish et al.

Having distinguished claim 14 over pool based on the claimed amendments shown above, it is believe the remaining claims that are dependent on claim 14 are patentable.

V. CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection are believed to have been properly overcome, traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. The Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that a personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/593,328
Amendment dated
Reply to Office Action of March 17, 2009

Docket No.: 41557-236442

Dated:

Respectfully submitted,

By/s/
Robert Kinberg
Registration No.: 26,924
Robert S. Babayi
Registration No.: 33,471
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, DC 20043-9998
(202) 344-4000
(202) 344-8300 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant